Nixon's "Low Posture" The Same Old Pax Americana, P. 3

The Key Questions As A New Vietnam Threatens In Laos

"Can the reservation of war powers to the Congress be circumvented by redesignating soldiers as agents of the Central Intelligence Agency? Can such military actions by the CIA be accorded the clandestine status of authentic intelligence operations?" *—Mathias (R. Md.) in the Senate Feb. 25.*

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL XVIII, NO. 5 MARCH 9, 1970 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Who Are The Real Kooks In Our Society?

It's hard to judge which is worse—the vulgarity or the stupidity of government officials in dealing with the Chicago conspiracy trial. The U.S. Attorney, Foran, attacks the defendants as "fags", sneaks and scum. The Cook County Sheriff has them sheared of their long hair in jail and exhibits the photos at a political rally as an example of "how Republicans get things done." Vice President Agnew calls them "kooks." If the Administration wants to provoke more student rioting, this is the course to pursue. Nothing could make a sizeable portion of our youth more sympathetic to the defendants than forcible hair-cuts, for their hair is the symbol of their revulsion against a society they see as morally bankrupt. The name-calling will sound all too reminiscent of parents too dense to understand the anguish of youth.

Mitchell Was Warned

Agnew asked that these "kooks . . . demagogues . . . social misfits" be kept off the front pages and the TV screens. If the Administration wanted to keep them off, it should have had more sense than to bring them to trial. An Associated Press dispatch* reveals that there were lawyers in the Justice Department who warned that the statute making it a crime to cross state lines to incite a riot was of doubtful constitutionality, that the trial would inevitably become political and that the accused might turn it into a circus which would embarrass the government. Attorney General Mitchell overruled them and now the Vice President seems to want more of the same. He told the Governors Conference in Washington, "Let us react automatically, briskly and effectively to the threat of violent revolution and recognize it for the clear and present danger it constitutes." To call it "a clear and present danger" is to invoke the Supreme Court's rationale for justifying the restriction of fundamental liberties in a time of imminent danger. Only the far-out Weatherman faction of the SDS is kooky enough to join Agnew in imagining that a rash of window-breaking by students puts the government of the United States in imminent danger of overthrow. And nothing would do more to foster blind revolutionary rage on the campuses and in the ghettoes than to start filling the jails with more student and radical leaders.

An Agnew at large poses more danger to social stability than the Chicago defendants. One passage in his appeal to the Governors was the authentic voice of repressionist ideology. He called on the Governors "to withstand the criticism of the liberal community, who are presently so blinded by total dedication to individual freedom that they cannot see the steady erosion of collective freedom . . ." To speak of being "blinded by total dedication to individual freedom" is strange language from an American Vice President in the capital of the so-called free world. This is not Jeffersonianism. It is a compote of decayed Leninism and left-overs from the Fascist era. The only meaningful freedom is individual. "Collective freedom" is the jailhouse liberty the Communist bureaucracy imposes on dissidents in Moscow, Warsaw and Prague, and the military junta of Papadapoulos on Athens. There are a few wacky Maoists on the fringes of the youth movement who sound in this respect just like Agnew. The Vice President has taken a Great Leap Forward.

The Nixon Administration is exhibiting the classic symptoms of a regime headed for deep trouble. A revolutionary is to a society what a pain is to an organism, a warning that something is wrong. Not to heed the pain is to let the disease proceed until it is too late for remedy. It would be wiser to listen to these "kooks" than to try and suppress them. I know most of the Chicago defendants and their lawyers personally and I regard them—and history will—as among the best of our time. Not many people are willing to risk jail to warn

(Continued on Page Four)

Senator McGovern On Judge Hoffman

His unfair and injudicious conduct may have done more to alienate and radicalize many of our young people than all of the defendants have succeeded in doing over the years. . . . He refused to allow the jury to hear one single word of the testimony from Ramsey Clark, who was the Attorney General of the United States at the time of the convention. I regard that ruling as outrageous. He personally held the defendants and their attorneys in contempt, instead of disqualifying himself and referring the matter to another judge. . . . The judge made what is to me an extraordinary and appalling ruling when he held that the Government had an automatic right to wiretap or bug the defendants without any prior authorization by a court. . . . This doctrine . . . is repugnant to our basic system of equal justice. Of like import is the denial of bail to the defendants pending appeal. . . . The real test of a judge is not how he conducts himself when the defendants are well-behaved and respectful, but rather, how he presides when the defendants are neither well-behaved nor respectful.

—McGovern (D. S.D.) in the U.S. Senate Feb. 25.

***Jean Heller, AP, in the Washington Post Feb. 27**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Behind Nixon's Blackout On His 5-Year Plan for Military Spending

Nothing makes life more interesting than outwitting censorship. In our last issue we called attention to the fact that Nixon had blacked out the cost of the war from his new budget and also the military side of his new 5-year Federal program projections. The best clue to the first figure, we pointed out, was that the Pentagon itself, ten days before the budget was released, was still giving $17 billion as the cost of the Vietnam war next year. We can now offer some light on the blacked out projections which hide how Nixon plans to divide resources between military and civilian needs.

A One-Third Rise In Strategic Forces

The first clue appeared, though unnoticed, in Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard's statement on the ABM to Senate Armed Services Feb. 24. He said current ABM plans "should keep the total costs for investment and operation of our strategic forces at about $12 billion dollars (1969 level) in future years." A briefing officer at the Pentagon agreed that this was the first public clue to the planned level of future military spending, and said he was himself surprised by its inclusion in Packard's statement. Perhaps to make the $12 billion figure look like less of a jump, he gave me actual expenditure figures for strategic forces—$9.1 billion in '69 and $10 billion in '71.* Using these figures we can see the Administration plans an increase of about one-third in spending on strategic forces over '69 *in terms of '69 dollars*. The actual dollar amounts will be higher if inflation continues. Since strategic forces—which include ABM and MIRV—are the heart of the nuclear arms race, this is no small escalation. And if strategic forces rise by a third in cost, we may expect much the same rise for "general purpose" forces, which include the Navy, especially in view of the strategy Nixon has just unveiled (see next page).

A second clue to what lies ahead in military spending may be found in the Comptroller General's report (Feb. 6) on "Status of Acquisition of Selected Major Weapons Systems." This is partial only for it turns out that the Pentagon does not maintain "a central file on the total number of systems being acquired or their costs." Perhaps it's more convenient *not* to know. The General Accounting Office as of June 30, 1969, was able to get figures only on 131 "major programs . . . in various phases of the acquisition process." Total costs were estimated at "about $141 billion" of which only $55 billion has been funded by Congress. This leaves $86 billion still to be appropriated to pay for them as they reach completion. On a 10-year basis that is $8.6 billion a year; on a 5-year basis, which seems more realistic, since these are items in the works, it would be $17 billion a year. The total figures are likely to be an underestimate, since the same GAO report says that current cost estimates were running 50 percent higher than originally planned. If that same trend continues, the $86 billion could turn out to be more than $120 billion before the final bills are paid.

Compare these monstrous expenditures for new weapons with the table on five year projections at p. 80 of the Economic Report. These are deliberately opaque. But under "new initiatives" we find grants-in-aid (which include anti-pollution) rising from $2 billion in fiscal '71 to $7 billion in fiscal '75 while "transfer payments to persons" which include the new Nixon social welfare program) rise from $3 billion in fiscal '71 to $5 billion in fiscal '75. Human and natural resources are still the stepchildren of the budget.

*** These figures are not in the budget. The budget only gives obligational figures for strategic forces and other major programs. This tends to hide the size of actual spending. The budget gives obligational authority for strategic forces as $8.6 billion for '69 and $7.9 billion for '71. The spending runs higher because of the huge backlog in unspent Pentagon funds.**

Footnote on The Anti-Busing Hysteria

Now a word on busing. I know how inflammatory it is in the districts of some of my colleagues. The fact of the matter is that there is more busing when there are two school systems than there can ever be when there is either de facto segregation or an attempt to create some racial balance. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare has testified that in 300 cases where districts have submitted school plans, in 290 of them there was less busing as a result of these plans which ended the dual system. In less than 10 was there more busing. I am asking you to disregard the hysteric conversation that has gone on in the cloakrooms about busing. How they get to school is not nearly as important as the fact that they all go to unified, desegregated schools with the best available curriculums.

—Rep. Conyers (D. Mich.), Feb. 19 (abr.) Con. Rec., H1097.

Senator McCarthy on Vietnamization and His Talks With The Other Side In Paris

The President speaks of "honorable settlement" or a "just peace". What honor has been gained by the death and destruction that has gone along with our overwhelming military power, and what will be gained from the continuation of the war? Vietnamization will not work. It has been tried repeatedly over the past 20 years—first by the French and later by us. It was after all the inability of the South Vietnamese army to fight effectively after more than 10 years of training and equipment by the U.S. that prompted the dispatch of American combat troops in 1965. Even [if it worked] there would still be the question of whether Vietnamization is desirable. Asians would be killing Asians with American arms. We will have made of the Vietnamese army, if the Nixon policy is "successful", essentially a mercenary army fighting its own people for an unrepresentative government.

I believe that a negotiated settlement of the war is possible and that the time to seek such a settlement is now. What will happen if the level of our involvement becomes insufficient to avoid defeat? Will we escalate our efforts or will we then negotiate from weakness?

Serious negotiations cannot proceed unless we are willing to support a coalition government to control the process of transition. The task of the interim government would be to arrange a cease-fire and to assure the orderly withdrawal of foreign forces. My conversations with the NLF and the North Vietnamese delegations in Paris lead me to these conclusions: (1) The North Vietnamese are not counting on winning the war in Washington. (2) They say that no such [massive post-settlement] executions [as are feared] would occur. (3) They anticipate that North Vietnam would not take over South Vietnam and that for years some division would exist between North and South. (4) They seek a commitment on troop withdrawal. This would be accompanied by an agreement on a provisional government and immediate negotiations with reference to prisoners of war.

—Sen. Eugene McCarthy (D. Minn.), before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Feb. 19 (abridged).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The ABM In Nixon's Strategy For A U.S. Protectorate Over Asia

Nixon in his quiet way is a more skilful con man than Johnson. His pretentious State of the World message was, as the *Washington Post* called it, "an advertising brochure" rather than a state paper: typical J. Walter Thompson soap copy garnished fore and aft with Nixon's own unmistakable purple prose. The *Washington Star,* normally rather pro-Nixon, agreed and put its finger in a biting editorial (Feb. 19) on what Nixon did *not* say: "He did not say that the U.S. never again will allow itself to be lured into a land war on the Asian mainland" nor what he would do in the Middle East, or if Romania were invaded or if Vietnamization failed. "That," it commented, "is quite a few rather important *nots.*"

"Greater Than Expected Threats"

Read carefully, the Nixon message and the Laird "posture" statement which followed it spell out not a "low posture" policy in Asia but the clear intent to establish an American protectorate there. Nixon's "1½" war strategy includes keeping "general purpose" forces adequate "for simultaneously meeting a major Communist attack in either Europe or Asia, assisting allies against non-Chinese threats in Asia, and contending with a contingency elsewhere" (as in Latin America). This is still the *Pax Americana.* He intends to keep sufficient forces in Europe to insure even against "greater than expected threats" (a little phrase which spells billions in unnecessary outlays) of conventional attack. "To meet the requirements for this strategy," Nixon said, "we will maintain the required *ground* and supporting tactical air forces in Europe *and Asia,* together with naval and air forces." (Our italics.) Where will he keep the ground troops? In Vietnam?

Nixon's "grand design" for Asia calls for an ABM in order to be able to threaten a first strike against China without suffering damage from a "death spasm" retaliatory blow on an American city some day from the handful of ICBMs China may have in the mid-'70s. This strategy surfaces at p. 43 of the Laird posture statement. Nixon has been fed some nonsense by his advisers on the ABM. At his Jan. 30 press conference he said he was going ahead on an ABM "area defense" because it would be "virtually infallible" against a Chinese attack. There *is* no infallible ABM. Even Laird, slippery as he is, went no further in his Feb. 24 presentation to Senate Armed Services than to say a complete 12-site area defense would provide "substantial" protection "for a number of years" against China. We hope that in the closed door session he was asked what "substantial" means—how many people might still be killed?—and for how many years would this shield last?

Two days later Dr. Foster, the Pentagon's Director of Defense Research and Engineering, made two admissions before the same committee which confirm what critics of the ABM said last year. Admission No. 1: "If the Soviet forces continue to grow, Minuteman defense may not be economical with a system using only Safeguard radars." Why, then, spend money on these radars when Dr. Foster says better and cheaper ones are under development? More fundamental was Admission No. 2: "We are not sure that the problems of land-based missile survivability can be solved permanently." The critics last year said these missiles were rapidly approaching obsolescence. Dr. Foster admitted we may soon have to switch to sea-based forces. Why then embark on a program that may cost $50 billion to replace Minuteman I with the MIRV-ed Minuteman III and to defend soon-to-be-obsolete missiles with a soon-to-be-obsolete ABM? Is this national defense or a guaranteed welfare system for A.T.&T. and the electronics industry?

NATO Far More Inflationary Than HEW

Today, 25 years after the end of World War II, 1.2 million American troops are overseas—310,000, or more than 25 percent, are in Europe. Of the troops in Europe, about 220,000 are in West Germany. Along with our troops in Europe are 235,000 dependents and 14,000 U.S. civilian employees—a total of 559,000 Americans in Western Europe. This represents a larger U.S. military presence than the United States currently has in Vietnam where an actual war is going on. To support this military presence in Europe a tremendous drain is placed on the U.S. budget. It costs $14 billion annually to support our troops in NATO. In addition, associated with the military commitment, is a $1.5 billion balance of payments deficit—a $1 billion deficit in Germany alone. . . . But just last month, because of inflation and budget strain, the President had to veto the HEW appropriation bill as he felt—desirable as the purposes of the bill were—that the budget could not afford the extra $1.2 billion level of spending called for in the bill.

—Sen. Percy (R. Ill.), Feb. 20 Cong. Rec., S2058.

Symington Learns The One Firm Date for Our Withdrawal From Vietnam Is Mañana

Sen. SYMINGTON: When I was out there in early 1967 and late 1967 there was the same amount of optimism about the program, but it did not work out that way, and I imagine that is one of the reasons they sent you.

Ambassador W. E. COLBY [a former CIA man now in charge of "revolutionary development" in Vietnam, recently renamed "rural development". It should more accurately be called "counter-revolutionary" development]: I would not say that, Senator.

Sen. SYMINGTON: If the U.S. troops and support left, do you believe that the Thieu-Key government, provided the North Vietnamese retreated, that they could control the country as against the Viet Cong?

Mr. COLBY: I believe so.

Sen. SYMINGTON: And if the North Vietnamese stayed interested after all this training you are doing and all the material we have given them, how long do you think it will be before we can get out?

Mr. COLBY: I frankly cannot give you a date on it.

Sen. SYMINGTON: Would you say five years?

Mr. COLBY: I really don't have a number. It depends on a lot of things.

Sen. SYMINGTON: If you are not sure about five, how about ten years? When I was in the Executive branch, they promised the troops in Germany would stay a maximum of 18 months, and they have been there for a quarter of a century. Then Korea was going to be pretty fast, and they have been there 20 years, so I am not being facetious.

Mr. COLBY: I think they could get out if nothing else arose during those ten years that caused a revision of the estimate, no new situation arose.

Sen SYMINGTON: Like what?

Mr. COLBY: Like a change in the overall situation in the Far East. [This implies we might keep Vietnam as a base against China or some other Asian power—IFS].

Sen. SYMINGTON: You were not sure about five, but you are pretty sure about ten. How about seven, seriously?

Mr. COLBY: I don't think I can really fix a time for you, Senator.

—Before Senate Foreign Relations Feb. 17 (abridged).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Only Way To Restore Faith In The Courts And In Orderly Change

(Continued from Page One)

society of its perils. However, and to whatever degree, right or wrong, they deserve a thoughtful hearing, because they speak for a better generation. They reflect the despair of younger people who fear atomic annihilation within their lifetime unless the nuclear buildup and all the sheer suicidal institutional folly behind it can somehow be reversed. They see America drifting toward race war at home and abroad unless the conscience of the dominant whites can be raised to a level where equality would make fraternity possible. They have increasingly lost faith in the possibility of peaceful change as they confront the baffling immobility of the establishment, military and civilian.

Agnew Sounds Hysterical

Governments are not overthrown. They overthrow themselves. They see critics as plotters. They over-react and lose their balance. From the Bourbons to Batista one may read this same story. Agnew showed the all too familiar blindness. He told the Governors the greatest issue facing the country was "not the war in Vietnam, nor inflation, nor the environment." It is, he said, "Will the government of this country remain in the hands of its elected officials or will it descend to the streets?" This is as topsy-turvy as it is hysterically overwrought. Vietnam, inflation, pollution are major causes of the unrest and major proofs of the government's incapacity. Without them, there would be little turbulence on the campus and in the streets. With them, the turbulence will grow. Who is Agnew to speak of "kooks"? What could be kookier than continuing a cruel, costly, divisive and unwinnable war? What could be kookier than spending 53 cents of every general revenue dollar on the Pentagon for more overkill and four-tenths of one cent per general revenue dollar (as Nixon proposes in his new budget) on what he himself says is a "now or never" attempt to save the air we breathe and the water we drink? What could be kookier than the priorities of our society?

I do not share the revolutionary outlook because I think it is gimmicky, another "instant" recipe in our world of commercials. The problems of war, racism, bureaucracy and pollution are everywhere; no society has solved them; their roots are deep in the ancient conditioning of man and in his inability to control technology. Man himself is obsolete unless he can change. That change requires more altruism; more kindness, more—no one need be ashamed to say it—love. It will not come about by calling other people "pigs" instead of liberating ourselves by seeing them with compassion as fellow prisoners of conditioned reflexes and institutional molds. But if there were no handful of the desperate in the ghetto and on the campus to make threats and hurl rocks, who in our smug and complacent established order would begin to listen and to move a little?

I do not think the revolutionaries, black or white, can remake our society but I think they can make it increasingly unliveable. The antidote is justice, justice in the courts and the justice of social equality. The cost will not be light but it will be lighter than the cost of injustice. Either we learn from the Chicago prosecution or we compound its follies. The wiser course began in the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals when it unanimously reversed Judge Hoffman's refusal of bail to defendants and counsel. The courts can save their reputation in the eyes of our youth, and restore faith in law and in orderly change, by going on to reverse the whole mess of convictions, the contempts included, and to hold unconstitutional the new statute under which they were reached. In a vast Republic, which prospered by the lack of barriers to free travel and free trade among its many States, this law would make it hazardous to speek freely once a state line had been crossed. It would suspend the First Amendment in interstate travel and set the traps of repression.

Suppose It Were Hammers and Sickles?

As a black woman, I am dismayed by the fact that within the Capitol Restaurant he [Gov. Maddox of Georgia] was allowed to pass out ax handles, his personal symbol of resistance to the order of the highest court and the laws of this Congress . . . I would like to pose this question to my esteemed colleagues. What would your reaction and the reaction of the Capitol Police Force have been if this anti-American display had been carried out by members of the Black Panthers, the SDS, the American Nazi Party or the Communist Party of America and the symbolic weapons they had chosen were toy guns and not ax handles? How many of them would be in jail at this very moment?

—Rep. Chisholm (D. N.Y.) in the House Feb. 24.

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope

FOR STONE'S HIDDEN HISTORY

For the enclosed $7.50 send I. F. Stone's book, **The Hidden History of The Korean War** (Monthly Review Press.)

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 3/9/70

4420 29th St. N. W., Washington, D. C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

4420 29th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly. 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Isrnel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED